



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,651	12/04/2000	Hyun Gi Choi	9983.106US01	3074

23552 7590 04/23/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD PC  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

*PO*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/729,651

Applicant(s)

CHOI ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10 and 12-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

  
DIANE MIZRAHI  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on 03-February-2003, the Abstract of the disclosure is amended by the applicant. Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.
2. Upon further review and updating of the prior art search for this application, the examiner cited an additional reference teaching the recitations of independent claims 7 and 11. The allowance of claims 7 and 11 as indicated in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn in view of the newly cited reference. The examiner regrets any inconvenience caused by this reconsideration.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A). A translated copy is provided for reference with this office action.

As to claim 1, Kazunari teaches an Internet address system structure (see page 4/17, paragraph [0002]) for introducing a telephone network number system (see page 7/17, paragraph [0009]), comprising:

Art Unit: 2175

a top level aggregation identifier field (see pages 2/17-3/17, SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, where “top level aggregation identifier field” is read on “terminal identification number”); and

a telephone number code field classified based on a telephone number system (see page 7/17, paragraph [0009].)

As to claim 2, Kazunari teaches wherein the telephone number code field comprises:

a country code field for distinguishing the respective countries (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 7);

an area code field for distinguishing domestic areas (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 7, where “area code field” is read on “trunk code”);

a central office code field for identifying the central office serving the subscriber (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], lines 7-8, where “central office code field” is read on “local office number”); and

a station number field for identifying a particular station in the central office code (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 8, where “station number field” is read on “local number”).

As to claims 3 and 6, Kazunari teaches wherein IPv6 address system is used as the internet address system (see figure 6, and see pages 12/17-13/17, EXPLANATION OF DRAWING, items 43~48, where IP version 4 is taught) and E.164 number system is used as the telephone network number system (see figure 1, field 15, and see page 12/17, FIG. 1, paragraph (c).)

As to claim 4, Kazunari teaches a hierarchical routing method using an internet address system (see page 4/17, paragraph [0002]) introducing a telephone network number system (see page 7/17, paragraph [0009]), wherein a routing process is performed in the internet address system (see Abstract, and see page 2/17, OBJECT paragraph), by using the telephone number system (see page 7/17, paragraph [0009]) consisting of hierarchical administrative district codes (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], lines 6-9), the hierarchical routing process being integrated or segmented according to the respective steps of the telephone number system in countries worldwide.(see pages 8/17-9/17, paragraph [0012], where “international connection” is discussed.)

As to claim 5, Kazunari teaches wherein the hierarchical routine process comprises:

- a first step wherein a router of a country code hierarchy identifies a country code, and forwards to a corresponding country (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 7);
- a second step wherein a router of a domestic area code hierarchy identifies a domestic area code, and forwards to a corresponding area (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 7, where “domestic area code” is read on “trunk code”); and
- a third step wherein a router of a central office code hierarchy identifies and routes a destination the same (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], lines 7-8, where “central office code” is read on “local office number”); with a corresponding subscriber number (see page 9/17, paragraph [0013], line 8, where “subscriber number” is read on “local number”).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

6. Claims 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474.)

As to claim 7, Dunworth et al teaches an internet address system (see column 6, lines 4-14) introducing a zip code system (see column 24, lines 36-39), comprising:

a top level aggregation identifier field (see column 24, lines 48-52, where “top level aggregation identifier” is read on a “tag”);

a zip code field classified by the zip code system (see column 24, lines 36-39); and

a subscriber identification number field which is a final identifier field (see column 7, lines 31-47.)

As to claim 11, Dunworth et al teaches a hierarchical routing method (see column 3, lines 1-8) using an internet address system (see column 6, lines 4-14) introducing a zip code system (see column 24, lines 36-39), wherein a routing process is performed in the internet address system (see column 6, lines 4-14), by using the zip code system consisting of

Art Unit: 2175

hierarchical administrative district codes, the hierarchical routing process being integrated or segmented according to the respective steps of the zip code system in countries worldwide (see column 8, lines 30-36.)

*Allowable Subject Matter*

7. Claim 8-10 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474), Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), and Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the zip code field comprises:

a high level area code field for distinguishing high level areas;

a middle level area code field for distinguishing middle level areas; and

a low level area code field for distinguishing low level areas, as claimed in claim 8.

The prior art of record, Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474), Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), Kushita (U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 2175

5,872,518), and Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

the system further comprising a country number field distinguishing the respective countries, as claimed in claim 9.

The prior art of record, Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474), Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), and Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein Ipv6 address system is used as the internet address system, and the zip code system of the respective countries are used as the zip code system, as claimed in claim 10.

The prior art of record, Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474), Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), and Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein the hierarchical routing process comprises:

a first step wherein a router of a high level area code hierarchy identifies a high level area code in the zip code system, and forwards to a corresponding high level area;

a second step wherein a router of a middle level area code hierarchy identifies a middle level area code in the zip code system, and forwards to a corresponding middle level area;



Art Unit: 2175

a third step wherein a router of a low level area code hierarchy identifies a low level area code in the zip code system, and forwards to a corresponding low level area; and

a fourth step wherein a router of a subscriber ID number hierarchy identifies a subscriber ID number, and routes to a destination identical to the subscriber ID number, as claimed in claim 12.

Claim 13 is objected to because it is dependent from the objected to dependent claim 12.

The prior art of record, Dunworth et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474), Feldmeier et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,414), MeLampy (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,186), Kushita (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,518), and Kazunari (Japanese Patent No. 408163173A) do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein IPv6 address system is used as the internet address system, and the zip code systems of the respective countries are used as the zip code system, as claimed in claim 14.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 03-February-2003 with respect to claims 1-7 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Art Unit: 2175

*Conclusion*

10. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4887. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

tm

April 11, 2003